



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Walter who levied in 1366 Yorkshire bowmen for John fighting in France and who won by marriage the arms of Scrope which Chaucer knew so well? Was it in these days that he mastered the dialect of the Northern students of his *Reeve's Tale*? All this is pleasing guess-work.

It is not, however, mere guess-work that, by the identification of "rich hill" with Richemont, Chaucer's earliest original work of note is, like Spenser's, closely associated with the North. May we mark the interesting coincidence that this particular corner of Yorkshire is linked with yet another of Chaucer's great contemporaries? John Leland tells us in his famous *Itinerary*: "They say that John Wyclif, Hereticus, was borne at Spreswell, a poore village, a good myle from Richemont." It is a pretty coincidence, too, that to the country near Richmond belongs another poetic record of "hart-hunting,"—Wordsworth's *Hart-Leap Well*.

FREDERICK TUPPER.

University of Vermont.

BRIEF MENTION

The Lay of Havelok the Dane. Re-edited from MS. Laud Misc. 108 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat. Second edition revised by K. Sisam (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1915). The first edition of this excellent text-book is dated 1902. Since then, to quote Mr. Sisam's words, "the criticism of *Havelok* has been greatly advanced by the work of Heyman [*Studies on the Havelok Tale*, Upsala, 1903] and Deutschbein [*Studien zur Sagengeschichte Englands, I. Teil: Die Wikingersagen: Hornsage, Haveloksage, Tristansage, Boevesage, Guy of Warwicksage*, Cöthen, Otto Schulze, 1906] on the story, by Holthausen's second edition [1910], and Professor Skeat's discovery of the Cambridge Fragments." But this current of "studies" flows on, as it should, and an article entitled "The Author of *Havelok the Dane*" (*Engl. Stud.* 48, 193-212) has appeared simultaneously with Sisam's revision. The writer of this last contribution to the subject contends that the English form of the romance lays bare the characteristics of an independent author, who "*was not far removed from the audience which he addressed*, and that he steeped his tale, not in the atmosphere of conventional romance, as most minstrels would have done, not in the atmosphere of the Vikings, but in *the atmosphere of contemporary, commonplace England*." So far as its author has re-traced the distinctive features of the English romance, there is merit in this article. Resuming the account of Mr. Sisam's edition, there is offered a "remodelled" Introduction; text and foot-

notes with slight changes (slight because of the stereotyped plates) to secure closer conformity to the ms.; Notes, however, that "are for the most part new"; and a thoro revision of what was already an excellent Glossary. Altogether new is the added text of the Cambridge Fragments, printed with the utmost accuracy.

Skeat's Introduction of sixty pages has been "remodelled" into forty. This contraction represents both a loss and a gain. The excising hand has removed many a line or paragraph, by which Skeat in his unhurried and rather discursive manner had meant to impart a wider interest to the matter in hand or to record contributory observations. The difference between the method of the earlier and that of the later editor may be seen at once by comparing the two forms of §3. The new section is shortened by a page, but by his accuracy in revision and his selection of pertinent details, Mr. Sisam has fully justified the change. On the other hand, Mr. Sisam has rejected an opportunity in his section on "Minor Versions" to engage the reader's attention in an entertaining and instructive manner. Skeat (§30) could not let the matter pass so lightly, and did enough in his enumeration of "the various forms of the story *later* than the English Lay" to give the hint for a chapter on the diffusion of stories that could be made attractive to the beginner, and valuable to the scholar for the exhibition of principles and methods in literary history. Nor has Mr. Sisam availed himself of the opportunity to write up in the best fashion the results of the efforts made by scholars to identify the historic elements of the story. The apology that only a "few weeks were available for the task of revision" cannot be accepted as satisfactory in so important a matter. It is right to ask, Why this haste? Is it dealing fairly with those for whom the book is intended to put forth hasty and incomplete work to be kept in use during the years this revision may meet the demands of the sales-room? Such questioning is not rightly answered by urging the fact that in this matter the latest investigators have arrived at no complete result, that they contend chiefly for denials of this and suppositions of that. Involved in the problem is too much of important national history and tradition to be disposed of in a few over-compressed paragraphs. At this point the reviser should have adhered more closely to Skeat's method and recounted in brief form the available records of persons and places, so as to show in what the difficulties of the problem consist. The inadequacy of this portion of Mr. Sisam's Introduction impels one to remind authors of text-books that Skeat never committed the too common mistake of not keeping in mind thruout an entire book a definite class of readers. He never made sudden transitions from lucidity and completeness into pre-suppositions thru which only the specialist could follow. His aim was to make all equally apprehensible to the particular reader he had in mind. Within the necessary limits of this notice, no parts of Mr. Sisam's work can be treated in detail. It is gratifying to

notice the excellence of his style, which is graceful and classic in its purity. He handles grammatical and metrical matter with clearness and notable accuracy. His notes are scholarly and compact, but never obscure. He is direct and business-like (as the expression goes), and proves himself equipped for the best grade of editorial work. One might dispute minor details, found here and there, or prefer a changed method of statement. Thus, in transferring from Skeat (p. xxiii) observations on *to* and on a use of the infinitive, Mr. Sisam (p. xxxvii) might have disposed of a simple matter by giving a useful definition of the "separable prefix," which should be understood as a separate adverb (the cited substantive *tō-gang* being subject to a different law of accentuation); and he should not have perpetuated the misleading statement that "the infinitive mood active [in some peculiar constructions] partakes of a passive significance." Finally, it will be found that the Introduction has been improved in the order and balance of its parts, and with advantage reduced in the number of pages at the sections relating to the language and meter of the poem,—sections that show admirably the learning and editorial skill of the reviser.

J. W. B.

Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff* of 1494 is one of the most important of German incunabula, not merely because there are no manuscripts extant, but also from the fact that we know that it was printed under the direct supervision of the author, who was an experienced proof-reader. Zarneke's edition (1854) gave a worthy reproduction of the text, but had to limit itself to a verbal description of the wood-cuts, which are so intimately connected with the text. This defect has now been remedied by the simultaneous appearance of two fac-simile editions. The one, prepared by Hans Koegler for the *Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen* (Weimar, 1913), gives an exact reproduction of the edition of 1494, without any explanatory matter, however, altho the temporary binding in which the volume is furnished seems to indicate that it is to be supplemented by a *Nachwort* of some sort. The other edition by Franz Schultz constitutes the first number of the publications of the *Gesellschaft für Elsassische Literatur*, (Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1913) and offers in addition to the fac-simile text an introduction of 56 pages, dealing in the main with questions pertaining to the wood-cuts. These vary at times in the different copies,—*e. g.*, on pp. 188, 217, 252, the two editions, made from different copies, offer different illustrations, whereas on pp. 26, 172, 178, for which differences are also noted by Schultz, the copies agree. The last page of the text proper (312), with the printer's name, seems to exist in as many as four different states, to judge from the reproductions in the two editions. Other textual differences

are noted by Schultz on pp. xii—xv, and a comparison of the leaves in question in the two fac-similes reveals additional differences, overlooked by the editor. For example, *hat*—*hatt*, p. 51, 5; *wil*—*vil*, 51, 15; *vil*—*wil*, 51, 21; *Und*, 51, 26; *keyn*—*Keyn*, 51, 30. Additional passages occur on pp. 52, 61, 62. These textual variations can be found in all early printed books of considerable size, particularly in the German Bibles of the fifteenth century, in some of which a double and even three-fold setting of various leaves can be noted. A discussion of the causes of these double printings, which Schultz is unable to explain, would lead us too far.

When Zarncke published his edition of the *Narrenschiff* in 1854, the edition of Rostock, 1519 (edited by C. Schroeder, 1892), was considered to be the earliest Low German version. In 1867 Zarncke discovered that the Library of the British Museum contained a Low German edition of Lübeck, 1497, and in 1900 Borchling discovered a second copy in the Royal Library at Stockholm. This oldest Low German version has now been made accessible by Herman Brandes: *Das Narrenschiff* von Hans Van Ghetelen (Halle, Niemeyer, 1914). Both of the extant copies of the original are slightly imperfect, but the editor, strange to say, did not use the Stockholm copy to complete that of the British Museum, but used instead the Rostock edition of 1519, because it was more accessible. The translation, as may be seen from the title given above, is ascribed by the editor to Hans Van Ghetelen, and the book itself is assigned to the so-called *Mohnkopfdruckerei* at Lübeck, the other productions of which are enumerated on p. xxi. These data will probably stand the test of time, but at any rate it would be no more than proper either to have the title page anonymous, as in the original, or else to add the name of Sebastian Brant.

W. K.

Richard Misyn's English translation (1435) of Richard Rolle of Hampole's *Incendium Amoris* was published many years ago by the Early English Text Society and this version has latterly (1914) been done into English by Frances M. M. Comper. If we except, however, the autobiographical chapter (ch. 15), which was included in early editions of Rolle's writings, the work in its original Latin form still remained unprinted up to last year, when an edition of it, by Margaret Deanesly, was issued under the auspices of the University of Manchester (Longmans, Green & Co.). The treatise does not leave on the reader who is familiar with the religious literature of the Middle Ages any marked impression of originality, and it is inferior in interest to the best of the same author's tracts in English; but Rolle is so important a figure in the history of English mysticism that an edition of the present work was desirable, and Miss Deanesly has accomplished her task with exemplary thoroughness. To be sure, her way had already been smoothed to a considerable extent by the researches of Miss Hope Allen of Rad-

cliffe College, whose striking article on the authorship of *The Prick of Conscience* (Radcliffe College Monographs, No. 15) will be remembered by students of Rolle. Miss Allen made the happy discovery of the best manuscript—Emmanuel College, Cambridge, MS. 35—of the *Incendium Amoris*, and she also supplied Miss Deanesly with a list of the other manuscripts of the work, of which in England alone there are twenty-six, all described with full details in the present edition. Not many years after the composition of the original treatise a shortened redaction came into circulation, and by a singular accident the best text of the *Incendium Amoris*—that which constitutes the basis of Miss Deanesly's edition—is found in a manuscript (the above-mentioned Emmanuel College, MS. 35) of this abbreviated version into which the missing portions of the original text were copied from Rolle's autograph copy of the work in its authentic form. The person who entered these missing portions—and from Rolle's own copy, as he tells us,—was John Newton, treasurer of York Cathedral in the late fourteenth century, and for a time, also, Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge. In her Introduction Miss Deanesly gives (compiled from documentary sources) a biographical sketch of this worthy, and also an account of the foundation of Sion Abbey. Newton's manuscript belonged to a Brigittine sister of this abbey in the early years of the sixteenth century.

J. D. B.

In his *Elementary Grammar of Colloquial French on Phonetic Basis* (W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, 1915, viii + 181 pp.), Mr. G. Bonnard, Professeur au Gymnase de Lausanne, has attempted to restate grammatical principles from the point of view of sound-change. Some interesting conclusions are reached. For example, "Most nouns have in the plural the same form as in the singular" (p. 12), and "Adjectives ending in a consonant in the masculine have, as a rule, only one form for both masculine and feminine" (p. 15). Naturally, important exceptions are noted in each case. A knowledge of phonetics being presupposed, paradigms, forms, and examples are printed in the script of the *Association phonétique internationale*; but close *o*, instead of open *o*, is nasalized throughout the book, and other modifications are noted (p. 2 ff.). As a grammar, the book has little, if any, value for elementary work, on account of the absence of exercises, questionnaires, and reviews; and its usefulness for reference or for advanced study is seriously impaired by its incompleteness (*cf.* title). If the strictly phonetic method is "well on the way to becoming general" (p. vi), and if "a need has arisen for a French Grammar suitable for those learning the language on these lines" (p. vi), the present work can hardly be said to supply the need satisfactorily.

H. S. W.